

REMARKS

Claims 14-21 were pending as of the final office action mailed March 6, 2007. A pre-appeal request for review was filed on September 6, 2007. A panel decision was mailed October 10, 2007. This reply is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination.

Claim 14 is currently amended for clarity. No new matter is added. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification, for example, at paragraphs [0050], [0054], [0055], [0066] and [0069]. Reconsideration of the action is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The examiner rejected claims 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,593 ("Hargrave").

Section 102 Rejections

Claim 14 was rejected over Hargrave. Claim 14, as amended, recites a method that includes returning search results written in a second format to the user, the search results referencing one or more documents responsive to one or more translated queries.

Hargrave discloses techniques for computer assisted translation of text strings in a source language to target language text strings. *See* Abstract. Hargrave uses pointers mapping source language n-grams with aligned target language n-grams. *See* Abstract.

Hargrave, however, does not return search results referencing one or more documents responsive to one or more translated queries. In Hargrave the "search results" are translated text strings corresponding to source language text strings. Hargrave does not translate the source text string and then perform a search for documents responsive to that translated text string. Therefore, Hargrave does not disclose or suggest returning search results written in the second format to the user, the search results referencing one or more documents responsive to the one or more translated queries, as required by claim 14.

The applicant respectfully submits that claim 14, as well as claims 15-21, which depend from claim 14, are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the forgoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 11, 2008

/Brian J. Gustafson/

Brian J. Gustafson

Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945